CHAPTER 8

The Qāḍīzādeli Movement and the Revival of *takfīr* in the Ottoman Age

Simeon Evstatiev

Defining "belief" (*īmān*) and "unbelief" (*kufr*) has been a major point of debate and contestation throughout Islamic history. The question "what is *belief*?" (*mā al-īmān*) has been answered by invoking different historical antecedents and doctrinal tenets, including shared references to earlier religious authorities. In general, Islamic conceptions of belief and unbelief have their origin in the moral and religious debates on the destiny of sinners in the afterlife.[1] The issue of whether the grave sinner is an unbeliever (*kāfir*) and therefore subject to capital punishment is one of the earliest religious questions to be posed in Islam and it carries strong political relevance.[2] The broader concept of "unbelief" is inseparable from that of "apostasy" (*ridda* or *irtidād*)—"severing ties with Islam" (*qaṭʿ al-Islam*)—which is punished by death.[3] The connection between *kufr* and apostasy became increasingly important during the Ottoman period, too, at least from the sixteenth century CE and after. A revived perception of the surrounding world as steeped in unbelief gained momentum in the activity of the violently puritan Istanbul-based Qāḍīzādeli movement (1620s–1680s), followed by the Wahhābī surge in eighteenth-century Arabia. The re-emergence of the accusations of unbelief vigorously promoted by these movements were the product of very different social, political, and cultural local contexts but they shared a pattern of understanding what the demands of "true belief" were and what an authentically Islamic orthodox creed should mean for Muslims. How to deal with unbelievers is certainly neither a new question, nor a question typical for only one of the branches of Islam.

---

* I would like to thank Dale F. Eickelman, Rudolph Peters, Alexander Knysh, Mark Sedgwick, and Rossitsa Gradeva for their support and helpful comments on an earlier stage of my ongoing project on Islamic revivalism in the post-classical period (1258–1798), from which the current chapter is an offshoot. The present chapter includes part of my research conducted at the Davis Center for Historical Studies, at the History Department of Princeton University, during the academic year 2013–2014.

1 Schöck, "Belief and Unbelief," p. 101.

2 "Unbelief" and "apostasy" are intertwined in the classical Islamic sources. See al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt*, p. 42.

3 Peters/De Vries, "Apostasy," p. 5.

 | DOI 10.1163/9789004307834_010

Unbelief and the question of whether those who have abandoned Islam are subject to capital punishment have been vividly debated topics among Muslims—Sunnīs, Shīʿīs, and Khārijīs alike. While some scholars, such as the mid-twentieth century ʿAbd al-Mutaʿālī al-Saʿīdī, whose work coincided with the momentum of modern nation building in the Middle East, have elaborated an argument against the "charge of unbelief" (*takfīr*) and argued that the apostate should be asked "to repent forever" (*an yustatāba dāʾiman*),[4] others are less tolerant. In recent years, an increasingly visible proliferation of charges of apostasy (*irtidād*) against members of the Muslim community (*umma*) "has become an effective political and legal weapon in the hands of some radical Muslim groups and individuals."[5] In general, contemporary Muslim scholars and movements privileging the accusations of unbelief are drawing upon a set of major tenets and discussions in Islamic sources. Those sources, however, demonstrate that the question of what unbelief encompasses has been subject to change over time. In some periods of Islamic history and in some Muslim states *takfīr*—declaring and accusing someone of being an "unbeliever" (*kāfir*)—was clearly shunned as a duty, while in others it was imperatively foregrounded in religious, public, and political life.

By highlighting the Qāḍīzādeli movement, the present chapter argues for continuity rather than rupture between the ideas promoted by its adherents and other revivalist strands in Islamic history. Indeed, the Qāḍīzādelis might have seemed to many a radical exception to Ottoman tolerance and laxity in the application of Islamic law (*sharīʿa*), and they might well have been such an exception in many ways. However, their struggle for a *sharīʿa*-minded reform brought about through reviving the beliefs and practices of the first Muslim generation in the first/seventh century seems not to have been entirely new; such trends appeared not only in the earlier Islamic experience in general but also in the earlier Ottoman intellectual and religio-political experience. The latter, as we shall see, is a particularly understudied field. The Qāḍīzādelis' vehement appeal for a purification of Islam and their questioning the faith of their contemporary Ottoman coreligionists stirred up controversies that, more than once, ended in violence against those who held different opinions.

I argue that by challenging the religious and political status quo, the preachers of the movement drew upon a two-fold intellectual trajectory: a larger

4 By which al-Saʿīdī (*Ḥurriyya*, pp. 72, 148, 156) refers to an isolated report (*khabar al-wāḥid*) transmitted by Ibrāhīm al-Nakhāʾī (d. ca. 96/717) that the apostate should "forever be asked to repent." For further references to this non-prevailing but still existent opinion, see Peters/De Vries, "Apostasy," p. 15 n. 41.

5 Griffel, "Toleration," p. 340.

classical and post-classical Islamic revivalist tradition, and an earlier, *sharīʿa*-minded Ottoman religious strand. It is in this sense that the Qāḍīzādeli movement was one of the culminations of an already existing trajectory in Islamic history rather than an exception or a radical rupture. Such an argument requires—instead of overemphasizing the (sometimes alleged) Qāḍīzādeli tendency to admire and adopt Ḥanbalī doctrines within the Ottoman context—that we also consider strict Ḥanafism, to which the adherents of this movement belonged. I am thus seeking to build an argument for the rise of Qāḍīzādelis as a result of the entanglements between this strict Ḥanafism and a larger Islamic revivalist tradition, which is mostly but not exclusively related to the Ḥanbalī *madhhab*.

In what follows, I offer a conceptualization of the Qāḍīzādeli movement through the prism of belief vis-à-vis unbelief. In so doing, I shall firstly introduce the concept of *takfīr*, including some of its classical foundations relevant to the debates in the Ottoman age, as a means for distinguishing belief and unbelief. I shall then go on to the Qāḍīzādelis themselves, suggesting a framework for inquiry into their role in the spread of heightened awareness of unbelief in the Ottoman age. I shall thus argue that, among other things, the Qāḍīzādeli orthodoxy staged in the Ottoman religious scene was distinguished by a strong emphasis on the struggle against unbelief that was embodied in the proliferation of "heretical innovations" (*bidaʿ*), not all of which were to be subsumed under the rubric of *takfīr*, with its strict legal consequences. Finally, I will adduce some instances that delineate some traceable lines of continuity between the Qāḍīzādelis, their inspiration, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Birgiwī, known also as Birgili Meḥmed Efendi (d. 1573),[6] and other Ottoman and Arab-Islamic revivalist scholars and religious groups.

1 Discerning Revivalism: The Charge of Unbelief

"Revivalism" is used here to refer to "a stance that formulates its critique of the contemporary state of affairs in terms of a return to an idealized early Islamic period."[7] Furthermore, Islamic revival "involves a strengthening of the Islamic dimensions of society. However, intensification of Islamic identity

6 But also as Birgivī, Birgiwî, Birkawî, or al-Birgawī. The variations are a result of the different readings of the Arabic letter *kāf* (ک), modified as *gef* (گ), used by the Ottomans for the Turkish "g," in this case for writing the city name Birgi, as well as by the alternative of either an Arabic or an Ottoman Turkish adjectival ending.

7 Hirschler, "Traditions of Revivalism," p. 196.

is not identical with the characteristic patterns of revivalism."[8] Focusing on the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, scholars such as John Voll[9] and Rudolph Peters[10] have suggested a typology of the "fundamentalist mode of Islamic experience."[11] Voll considers three distinctive features of Islamic revivalism: a call for a return to the Qurʾān and the Sunna; a reaffirmation of authenticity, especially vis-à-vis syncretic tendencies; and, finally, an emphasis on the need to apply *ijtihād*—independent Islamic legal reasoning.[12] Peters emphasizes the attack on the obligatory character of *taqlīd*—the acceptance of or submission to authority, that is, the authority of one of the four major *madhhab*s. The scholars who shunned *taqlīd* and privileged a direct approach to the sources of Islam through *ijtihād* "belonged to the fundamentalist tradition in Islam."[13] To Peters, fundamentalist thinking in Islam draws on two major "concept-pairs": *sunna* ("the normative example of the Prophet") versus *bidʿa*[14] ("a deviation from the *sunna*, or the opposite of the *sunna*"); and *tawḥīd* ("monotheism") versus *shirk* ("polytheism").[15]

Others, however, have developed an argument against such a typology of revivalism. Ahmad Dallal offers an elaborate critique of those claims that repeatedly speak of "Wahhābī influences" on the thought of the Indian Shāh Walī Allāh al-Dihlawī (d. 1762), the West African ʿUthmān Ibn Fūdī (d. 1817), and the North African Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Sanūsī (d. 1859). Dallal questions "the theory of a united Islamic revivalism," and historian Bernard Haykel points out that in spite of its heuristic potential, the theory of a united Islamic revivalism can indeed be misleading. In his study on the Yemeni scholar and reformer Muḥammad al-Shawkānī (d. 1834), Haykel aligns himself with Dallal, emphasizing that "the substantive content of the ideologies of Islamic revival needs to be thoroughly researched before any broad generalizations can be made."[16]

8 Levtzion/Voll, *Renewal*, p. 15.

9 Voll, "Sudanese Mahdi," pp. 145–166.

10 Peters, "Dervishes," pp. 217–242.

11 Voll, "Linking Groups," p. 88.

12 Voll, "Renewal," pp. 32–47.

13 Peters, *Idjtihād* and *Taqlīd*, p. 131.

14 Innovation, a belief or practice for which there is no precedent in the time of the Prophet Muḥammad. See James Robson, "Bidʿa," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New Edition, vol. 1, p. 1199. On *bidʿa* as the opposite of *sunna* and thus as a concept corresponding to "heresy," see also Lewis, "Observations," pp. 52f.

15 *Shirk* is usually translated in Western languages as "polytheism," but the term implies "associationism," i.e. the act of "associating" other deities to the oneness and unity of Allāh.

16 Haykel, *Revival*, p. 13.

In fact, the scholars suggesting a typology of revivalism remain cautious, too, admitting that the "characteristic pattern of renewal and reform" exploring the "fundamentalist" mode of experience "has some limitations."[17]

A proper grasp of revivalism requires a consideration of orthodoxy, heresy, and the limits of religious pluralism within Islam.[18] The Islamic legal dictum *ikhtilāf al-umma raḥma* ("disagreement within the Muslim community is [a sign of] God's mercy"), established as early as the second/eighth century,[19] gives a sense of the possibility for internal pluralism. Nevertheless, the answer to the question of why this is so in Islam "cannot be that only Christian societies are concerned with imposing religious conformity."[20] Moreover, the acknowledged "disagreement" concerns certain details in questions of law and ritual, while dissent in dogmatics and religious doctrine (*ʿaqīda*) is not encouraged. Muslims from any school are bound to strictly defend their position. Or, as the Ḥanafī scholar Ibn Nujaym al-Miṣrī (d. 970/1563) puts it: "The truth is what we adhere to and the false—what is maintained by our opponent."[21] Despite its limits and the overemphasis on Islam as a religion of orthopraxy, orthodoxy has played an important role in all Islamic traditions.[22]

Analyzing religion as an anthropologist, Talal Asad suggests that "a tradition consists essentially of discourses that seek to instruct practitioners regarding the correct form and purpose of a given practice that, precisely because it is established, has a history. These discourses relate conceptually to *a past* (when the practice was instituted, and from which the knowledge of its point and proper performance has been transmitted) and *a future* (how the point of that practice can best be secured in the short or long term, or why it should be modified or abandoned), through *a present* (how it is linked to other practices, institutions, and social conditions). An Islamic discursive tradition is simply a tradition of Muslim discourse that addresses itself to conceptions of the Islamic past and future, with reference to a particular Islamic practice in the present."[23]

---

17 Levtzion/Voll, *Renewal*, p. 14.

18 See Knysh, "Essay of Reassessment."

19 Schacht, *Introduction*, p. 67.

20 Asad, *Idea*, p. 345.

21 Ibn Nujaym, *Ashbāh*, p. 418.

22 See Calder, "Limits." For a tentative but more detailed discussion of "orthodoxy" and "orthopraxy" in the study of Islam, see Evstatiev, "Qāḍīzādeli Movement," pp. 15–17. In the same study, I offer also a closer reflection on the relevant discussions around the eighteenth-century "Islamic Enlightenment" (pp. 9–11) and the issue of universal Islam vis-à-vis local contexts (pp. 12–13).

23 Asad, *Idea*, p. 14. For his anthropological views of religion, see Asad, "Anthropological Conceptions," pp. 237–259.

According to Asad, "Wherever Muslims have the power to regulate, uphold, require, or adjust *correct* practices, and to condemn, exclude, undermine, or replace *incorrect* ones, there is the domain of orthodoxy."[24] The practice of *takfīr* is thus one of the important Islamic discursive traditions demonstrating that "there *is* an Islamic tradition, a set of ideas, symbols, and interrelated texts and practices which may have a normative (although contested) force."[25]

In Western scholarship on Islam the search for the historical evolution of *takfīr* is a rare and only recent phenomenon. When Goldziher studied the accusations of unbelief within the Ashʿarite school of theology (*kalām*), he formulated their legal meaning as follows: a Muslim accused of unbelief has to be excommunicated; after his unbelief is proved in a sound manner he should be asked to repent (*istitāba*), in order to remain a member of the Islamic community (*umma*); and if he fails to do so, he is therefore subject to capital punishment.[26] As a whole, this view is widely and conventionally accepted also among Muslim scholars. Ḥamad ʿUbayd al-Kubaysī, editor of *Shifāʾ al-ghalīl fī bayān al-shubah wa-l-mukhīl*, by Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), which is one of the major classical Sunnī works dealing with *takfīr*, stresses the general agreement between the Islamic jurisprudents (*fuqahāʾ*) that the "secret apostate" (*zindīq*), even if he publicly professes Islam (*yaẓhar al-Islām*) has to be killed. Al-Kubaysī points out that disagreement among scholars of Islamic law emerged around the question of whether the repentance of an apostate (*murtadd*) should be accepted or not. Both Abū Ḥanīfa and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal ruled that the repentance of such an apostate must not be accepted—a view that was shared by Mālik b. Anas, while al-Shāfiʿī adopted the opposite opinion.[27]

The Mālikī school of law, which stresses that in order to be branded an apostate a man or woman would have to have professed Islam beforehand, defines *irtidād* as "unbelief [of the Muslim] whose Islam has been established with no doubt" (*kufr baʿda l-Islām taqarrara*). Mālikīs emphasize that a person's profession of the Islamic faith should be evident in both words (*qawl*) and

---

24 Asad, *Idea*, p. 15. Orthodoxy in Islam is viewed as the product of a "network of power" not only by anthropologists but also by Islamicists such as van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft*, p. 686. In Islamic history, religious authority and political power have correlated in cooperation and mutual support. However, quietism has also been an equally significant stance and alternative to the participation of religious scholars in power. Cf. Fierro, "Heresy," p. 896.

25 Berkey, *Popular Preaching*, p. 7.

26 Goldziher, *Vorlesungen*, p. 182.

27 al-Ghazālī, *Shifāʾ*, p. 222 n. 7.

actions (*ʿamal*). A person who becomes Muslim by simply pronouncing the Islamic profession of faith (*shahāda*) without observing the Islamic ritual practices, such as prayer (*ṣalāt*), nevertheless cannot be legally declared an apostate.[28] Analyzing this peculiarity of Islamic law, Rudolph Peters and Gert de Vries point out that apostasy (*irtidād*) is expressed through unbelief (*kufr*), "specified as words implying unbelief, deeds implying unbelief or, according to Shāfiʿite doctrine, the mere intention of unbelief. The apostatical words can be either explicit, viz. solemnly abjuring Islam, or implicit, viz. utterances incompatible with the theological consensus (*ijmāʿ*) or with the axiomatic articles of faith (*mā ʿulima min al-dīn ḍarūratan*)."[29]

Frank Griffel has suggested that for Goldziher there was little historical development within the verdict of *takfīr:* he "did not distinguish between the status of an unbelieving Muslim and that of a Muslim apostate, and thus he neglected the dynamics of this legal institution."[30] This view reflects subsequent studies on accusations of unbelief and apostasy in Islam, and research on the subject so far has not progressed to the point of outlining the historical development of *takfīr* and its inter-connectedness with *irtidād* and other Islamic concepts used to set a boundary between belief and unbelief. Already al-Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820) had established a clear connection between "unbelief" (*kufr*) and "apostasy" (*irtidād*). On the basis of a chapter from al-Shāfiʿī's *Kitāb al-Umm*, Griffel summarizes the views of the medieval scholar by stating that unbelief as such was not a legal offence incurring a death sentence. The unbeliever would be treated as an apostate only if he publicly and unyieldingly breaks with Islam. In terms of formulation, al-Shāfiʿī argues that one cannot separate the concept of apostasy from unbelief because the legal term "apostasy" cannot be understood without referring to the theological concept of "unbelief." Therefore, "the application of the legal term 'apostasy' is based on three necessary conditions: first, the apostate had to have once had faith according to al-Shāfiʿī's definition (meaning publicly professing Islam); secondly there had to follow unbelief (meaning the public declaration of a breaking-away from Islam); and thirdly, there had to be the omission or failure to repent after the apostate was asked to do so. These three criteria constitute apostasy and all three are necessary to pass capital punishment on a Muslim, while the first two are sufficient to classify a Muslim as an unbeliever."[31] Hence, according to the earlier classical Islamic doctrine, *kufr* was an instructive definition that could

28 al-Ḥaṭṭāb, *Mawāhib*, vol. 6, pp. 279f.

29 Peters/De Vries, "Apostasy," p. 3.

30 Griffel, "Toleration," p. 340.

31 Griffel, "Toleration," pp. 348f. Cf. al-Shāfiʿī, *Umm*, vol. 6, pp. 145–65.

serve to accuse someone of unbelief, while *irtidād* was a legally consequential concept referring to a person's final break from Islam. Dealing with the latter, Islamic law has envisaged the most severe among the punishments for the enemies of God—the death sentence.

Three hundred years after al-Shāfiʿī, Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī offered a fresh and more exclusivist Sunnī interpretation of what constitutes true Islamic belief and practice.[32] Unlike al-Shāfiʿī, to whom unbelief was not a legal offence, for al-Ghazālī the public profession of Islam did not suffice to make one a believer. Although the latter boldly emphasized the danger of the free practice of *takfīr*, an action that should not undertaken lightly, he assumed that—except for commoners—the enemies of the Islamic state and the propagators of incorrect beliefs and practices should be killed, without giving them the right to repentance (*istitāba*):

> It is well-known from the revealed law (*al-sharʿ*) that the unbeliever has to be killed (*anna l-kāfir maqtūl*), and we refrain from killing him if he repents. His repentance (*bi-tawbatihi*) is [accepted] to mean that he has abandoned his false religion (*al-dīn al-bāṭil*).[33] However, the secret apostate (*al-zindīq*) does not give up his false religion even if he pronounces the *shahāda*.... It is therefore licit (*fī ḥaqq*) to kill for his unbelief (*kufr*) him whom we consider a permanent unbeliever (*kāfiran mustamirran ʿalā kufrihi*).[34]

Al-Ghazālī compiled a separate work dedicated to the criteria of distinguishing between Islam and unbelief, in which he set apart chapters dealing with *takfīr* and the reasons for which one can be accused of unbelief.[35] Al-Ghazālī stresses that *takfīr* is a divinely ordained legal judgment (*ḥukm sharʿī*) and as such it enjoins confiscation of the unbeliever's property, the shedding of his blood, and an eternal punishment in hell (*al-ḥukm bi-l-khulūd fī l-nār*).[36] Al-Ghazālī thus was the most eminent Islamic theologian during the late classical period to emphasize the necessity of a strict interpretation of *takfīr*. In

32 More details on al-Ghazālī's theory of *takfīr*, see in Izutsu, *Concept*, pp. 23f.

33 It is not sufficiently clear to me why Griffel ("Toleration," p. 351 n. 53) reads *bāṭin* ("inner") instead of *bāṭil* ("false", but also "invalid")—it does not seem that the text has been corrupted here.

34 al-Ghazālī, *Shifāʾ*, p. 222.

35 al-Ghazālī, *Fayṣal*, pp. 53–67. More about this work see in Jackson, *Boundaries*. For a German translation of the work by Griffel, see al-Ghazālī, *Rechtgläubigkeit*.

36 al-Ghazālī, *Fayṣal*, p. 66.

the subsequent post-classical period, when the central Islamic lands were dominated by the Mamlūks and subsequently by the Ottoman dynasty, *takfīr* re-emerged in the works of Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) and the Ḥanbalites of Damascus, later discussed by tenth/sixteenth–eleventh/seventeenth-century Ottoman scholars, and culminating in movements as different as the Qāḍīzādelis and the Wahhābiyya.

2 The Qāḍīzādeli Movement and the Issue of Unbelief

The Qāḍīzādeli movement's "fundamentalist challenge"[37] and "discordant revivalism"[38] evolved from a passionately devout, markedly anti-mystical group of Muslim mosque preachers (Arabic *wuʿʿāẓ*, sg. *wāʿiẓ*; Turkish *vaiz*) on the periphery of the Ottoman religious establishment—the *ʿulamāʾ* hierarchy known in Ottoman Turkish as *ʿilmiye*. Acquiring a reputation as strict, rigorous, and pious Muslim preachers among their supporters, but designated by their Sufi adversaries in some Ottoman sources as "people of bigotry" (*ehl-i taʿaṣṣub*),[39] the Qāḍīzādelis prevailed over their rivals in eleventh/seventeenth-century Istanbul under the successive leadership of Qāḍīzāde[40] Meḥmed Efendi (d. 1045/1635), the Damascene by birth and education Usṭuvānī (d. 1072/1661), and Vānī Meḥmed Efendi (d. 1096/1684). They held a firm grip on Ottoman religious and public life during the reign of Sultan Murād IV, with his "conversion to piety,"[41] but began to be identified as "Qāḍīzādelis" during the height of their activities around 1061/1650–51—a time coinciding with the reign of Sultan Meḥmed IV.[42]

During Murād's reign and under Qāḍīzādeli pressure, coffeehouses and tobacco were banned on pain of death.[43] Smoking infractions resulted in a huge number of executions by dismemberment, impaling, or hanging.[44] The eminent Ottoman historian Ḥajjī Khalīfa, known as Kātib Çelebi (d. 1067/1657), relates the execution of "fifteen or twenty leading men of the army" on a charge

37 Zilfi, *Politics of Piety*, p. 134.
38 Zilfi, "Kadizadelis," pp. 251–269.
39 Terzioğlu, *Sufi and Dissident*, p. 199.
40 In modern Turkish transliteration: Kadızade, "the son of a judge."
41 Baer, *Honored by the Glory of Islam*, p. 105.
42 Naʿīmā, *Tārīkh*, vol. 5, pp. 54–59; vol. 6, pp. 227–241. See also Terzioğlu, *Sufi and Dissident*, p. 202.
43 Naʿīmā, *Tārīkh*, vol. 6, p. 231.
44 Ricaut, *History*, vol. 1, pp. 59, 79.

of smoking during a military expedition against Baghdad undertaken by Murād IV. Despite the "severest torture" in the presence of the sultan, however, "some of the soldiers carried short pipes in their sleeves, some in their pockets, and they found an opportunity to smoke even during the executions." Although telling with respect to social and religious developments, the Qāḍīzādeli-influenced ban on smoking was not a success story: "Even during this rigorous prohibition, the number of smokers exceeded that of the non-smokers."[45]

The appointment of the Qāḍīzādelis as Friday preachers provided them with direct access to the public, and their career path quickly offered them control over the so-called imperial mosques, such as Hagia Sophia (Aya Sofya), Sultan Aḥmed, Süleymaniye, Beyazid, Fātiḥ, Selim I, and Shāhzāde. Endowed over the centuries by the reigning lines of the Ottoman family, those imperial mosques were "inherently egalitarian,"[46] and apart from their ritual functions were a major venue for socializing and public discussions. It is telling that initially the Qāḍīzādelis were called "Birgiwī followers" (Turkish *Birgivī khulefāsı*) or simply "Birgiwīs" (Turkish *Birgivīler*), since all of them were religiously and intellectually inspired by the influential conservative religious scholar Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Birgiwī. His popularity spanned the entire Muslim world and he became "more than the author of much-copied works"[47] extensively referenced and commented upon in both Ottoman Turkish and Arabic.

Why then do the Qāḍīzādelis seem so enigmatic and invisible outside of Istanbul, when there is an apparent, though not sufficiently articulated, scholarly intuition of their significance over time and space? Were the Qāḍīzādelis a part of an interrelated set of Islamic revivalist impulses that included accusing other Muslims of unbelief (*takfīr*)? Did this metropolitan movement influence an entire complex network of revivalist groups during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, or was it rather one of the (inter)acting groups within a more general trend? The answers to such questions can so far not be given with absolute certainty due to the shortcomings in the state of recent research. Islamic intellectual history, and particularly the substantive teachings of the revivalist groups and their leaders in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has yet scarcely been examined. In general, Islam during the Ottoman centuries has been studied mostly in institutional terms, with a few exceptions, such as in the work of Madeleine Zilfi,[48] who explores Islamic religious life more broadly in the seventeenth century, which is seen as a period of

45 Kātib Çelebi, *Balance*, p. 51f.
46 See Zilfi, *Politics of Piety*, pp. 129f.
47 Cook, *Commanding Right*, p. 328.
48 Zilfi, *Politics of Piety*.

crisis followed by a more stable eighteenth century. Even Zilfi's seminal work, however, is based on developments in Istanbul alone. As a whole, the career patterns of the *ʿulamāʾ* are traced prosopographically, without examining their output in intellectual history—"the great lacuna in Ottoman history."[49]

The role of the Qāḍīzādeli movement outside Istanbul is so far unclear, and the spread of its ideas in the Arab East has until now lacked significant scholarly attention. A chapter in Zilfi's *The Politics of Piety*,[50] written after an article in Turkish by Ahmet Yaşar Ocak outlined the Qāḍīzādelis as a subject deserving special attention,[51] contains what is still the only published historical survey of the movement, while the only monographic studies devoted to it thus far are the doctoral dissertations of Necati Öztürk and Semiramis Çavuşoğlu.[52] These three works, however, focus heavily on the institutional and urban aspects of the Qāḍīzādelis, against the backdrop of central imperial policies, the *ʿilmiye*, and the movement's vehement struggle against the Sufis. It seems, however, that even the radical opposition between the Sufis and Qāḍīzādelis seems debatable and cannot be taken for granted.

For a long time, scholarship was under the influence of a view promoted by orientalists such as Sir Hamilton A.R. Gibb (1895–1971), according to whom Sufism opposed orthodoxy and the "Arab idea" of Islam; hence a "violent resistance to Sufism" has been expressed at least since the eighth/fourteenth century by "the fundamentalist Hanbalite, Ibn Taimiyya, and his small body of disciples."[53] Subsequently, Fazlur Rahman coined the term "neo-Sufism" to denote more specifically the eighteenth-century Sufi revival, which "tended to regenerate orthodox activism."[54] Until some two decades ago, it was widely accepted that this "neo-Sufism" combined a revivalist Wahhābī creed with a Sufi organizational structure. This convenient model, however, was dismantled by Rex S. O'Fahey and Bernd Radtke.[55] Sharing their view, Mark Sedgwick emphasized that now for most researchers "Gibb's and Fazlur Rahman's placing of Sufism in opposition to orthodoxy is unjustified."[56] In his turn, John Voll,

49 Hathaway, "Rewriting," p. 38; cf. Peirce, "Perceptions," p. 10. See also Peters, "Quest," p. 160; cf. Terzioğlu, "Man," p. 141. A notable book dealing with intellectual history is, e.g., Fleischer, *Bureaucrat*.

50 Zilfi, *Politics of Piety*, pp. 129–182.

51 Ocak, "Puritanizm," pp. 208–225.

52 Öztürk, *Islamic Orthodoxy*; Çavuşoğlu, *Ḳaḍīzādeli Movement*.

53 Gibb, *Modern Trends*, p. 24.

54 Rahman, *Islam*, p. 195.

55 O'Fahey, *Enigmatic Saint*, pp. 1–9 and, respectively, O'Fahey/Radtke, "Neo-Sufism," pp. 52–87.

56 Sedgwick, *Saints*, p. 28.

who extensively uses the term "neo-Sufism," suggested a reconsideration of the activist orders of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[57] Historian Derin Terzioğlu suggests that Sufi preachers had distinguished themselves as political commentators long before the emergence of the Qāḍīzādelis. She argues that Sufi and non-Sufi preachers during the seventeenth century "had complex relationships, which are not always accurately captured by such words as 'opposition', 'antagonism' and 'conflict'. To the contrary, a pronounced emphasis on adherence to the Sunna and a puritanical outlook on Ottoman social and cultural life united the reform visions of both groups."[58] Was, then, the radical struggle against unbelief promoted by the Qāḍīzādelis—but apparently not only by them—part of a deeper and larger-scale religious trend—be it related or not to what Tijana Krstić defines as "confessionalization" or a "Sunnitization" of the Ottoman Empire?[59]

The Qāḍīzādeli preachers not only denounced practices of disbelief and innovation by warning their listeners, but "sought to provoke the public and ultimately the Ottoman authorities into action."[60] Dror Ze'evi stresses that Muslim reform movements during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries "did not offer messianic salvation in the form of a charismatic leader. Their main objective was strict adherence to an orthodox interpretation of the law." Ze'evi concludes that the "Qāḍīzādeli conflict had spread across the Ottoman universe,"[61] however without discussing the character and channels of this spreading. The few other studies mentioning the Qāḍīzādelis within the social and religious context of the Arab East all focus on late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century developments in Egypt. Jane Hathaway, analyzing the Qāḍīzādeli opposition to Sabbatai Sevi, notes that "in his zeal to emulate the original Muslim community at Medina, Vānī Meḥmed Efendi conceived a goal of making Istanbul a purely Muslim city."[62] Two other studies consider an incident around the battered dervishes of Bab Zuwayla, with the Qāḍīzādelis

57 Voll, "Neo-Sufism," p. 317.

58 Terzioğlu, "Sufi Preachers," p. 243.

59 Krstić, *Contested Conversions*, pp. 12f. Marinos Sariyannis ("Kadizadeli Movement," p. 263) has suggested an approach to the Qāḍīzadelis' role in Ottoman social history by proposing to study its "well-known 'fundamentalism' that arose throughout the seventeenth century in the light of the emergence of new mercantile strata in the same period." He argues that the movement served the new classes in their struggle for political power in Istanbul and resorts to the paradigm of Max Weber to demonstrate that "Kadızadeli-minded statesmen could use the 'fundamentalist' ethics in promoting 'free-trade' measures."

60 Le Gall, "Kadızadelis," p. 3.

61 Ze'evi, *Producing Desire*, p. 95.

62 Hathaway, "Grand Vizier," p. 667.

qualifying it as proto-Wahhābī *fitna* in Ottoman Cairo.[63] Barbara Flemming later revisited the incident and suggested that it was not proto-Wahhābī as much as neo-Qāḍīzādeli.[64] Rudolph Peters and Barbara Flemming seem to be the only ones to have touched upon a possible connection between the Istanbul movement and the Wahhābī surge in the Arabian Peninsula.

In their studies on Wahhābiyya, scholars such as Michael Cook, Alexander Knysh, and Hamid Algar do not mention any connection with the Qāḍīzādelis.[65] Contemporary Saudi Arabian historians seem to focus on puzzling out the local details without conceptualizing the movement initiated by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (b. 1115/1703, d. 1206/1792) in Najd within the broader Islamic tradition and society.[66] The contextualization of the Wahhābī movement vis-à-vis its Qāḍīzādeli predecessor within the larger Islamic tradition still awaits clarification. The situation is similar regarding the historical evidence at our disposal for the radical purification of public morality in Bilād al-Shām during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Sources such as al-Budayrī's *Daily Events in Damascus*[67] and *sijill*s provide information about dramatic debates over piety and the measures taken by some *ʿulamāʾ* and preachers against the proliferation of unbelief through *bidʿa*, wrongdoing, and "evil" (*sharr*), which ranged from evil talk to wine drinking and prostitution, and from coffee drinking to tobacco smoking.[68] Again, it is unclear whether and how such dramatic events in the Arab East were an echo of the earlier Qāḍīzādeli orthodox impulse or of the almost contemporaneous Wahhābī surge.

One the few discussions of the Qāḍīzādeli impact in the Balkans is provided by Derin Terzioğlu, who touches upon some of the earliest traces of the movement's presence in Anatolia and Rumeli, arguing that the followers of Birgiwī had grown up as a social group identifiable not only in Istanbul, but also in the Balkans. She mentions a didactic-cum-comic work composed by a certain Ḥāccī Aḥmed in the town of Yanya (Yanina), in northwestern Greece, in 1056/1646–47. The book includes an inventory of offensive social types and curses them, and also contains an entry on "Birgivī followers (Birgivīler),

63 Flemming, "Vorwahhabitische Fitna," pp. 55–65; Peters, "Islamischer Fundamentalismus," pp. 93–115.

64 Barbara Flemming, unpublished paper given at a conference in Leiden (2002).

65 Cook, "On the Origins," pp. 191–202; Knysh, "Danger," pp. 3–26; and Algar, *Wahhabism*.

66 al-ʿUthaymīn, *Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb*.

67 al-Budayrī, *Ḥawādith Dimashq*. For more details about al-Budayrī and his eighteenth-century chronicle in Arabic, see Masters, "View," pp. 354–356.

68 Rafeq, "Morality," p. 181.

who show obstinacy in matters in which they are in the wrong."[69] In her 2010 article, the Ottomanist Rossitsa Gradeva mentions the issue of orthodoxy in her discussion of the movement and its possible influence in Sofia, referring to Evliya Çelebi (d. 1094/1682), according to whom Sheikh Meḥmed, known as Qāḍīzāde, "manifested himself here." Gradeva interprets this passage not as evidence that the founder of the movement was born in Sofia but in the sense that, more importantly, his ideas had spread in the town.[70] Kerima Filan analyzes the Qāḍīzādeli type of "religious fanaticism" in Sarajevo during the eighteenth century, based on notes (*majmua*) by Mula Mustafa Bašeski written between 1760 and 1805. Filan argues that the contents of the notes show that Sarajevo "fanatics" wanted to transform the religious life of the city in the same way "as the Qāḍīzādelis did in Istanbul in seventeenth century."[71]

The Oriental Department of the Bulgarian National Library in Sofia has preserved a collection of manuscripts including local copies of and commentaries on Muḥammad Birgiwī's *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, the content of which and whose interrelation with the transregional movement known as al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya is unstudied. The processing, cataloguing, and analyzing of the Arabic and Ottoman Turkish manuscripts from such important local Rumeli *waqf* library collections as the one in Samokov show that some of the manuscripts, and especially the commentaries on al-Birgiwī's *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya* by eighteenth-century scholars such as Aḥmad al-Kashfī al-Samaqūwī[72] and Aḥmad al-Ikhtimānī[73] deserve special further attention, at the very least because these works seem to have been widely used in the Balkans and beyond. There are indications that in some localities, including Samokov, al-Birgiwī's *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya* and its commentaries were the most widely borrowed books in the *waqf* libraries. During the month of Ramaḍān 1120/1708, al-Samaqūwī even traveled to Damascus, where he met one of the major commentators on al-Birgiwī, the Sūfī ʿAbd al-Ghānī al-Nābulusī, who polemicized with al-Birgiwī.[74] Further research on those manuscripts can reveal the trajectories of the spread of al-Birgiwī's ideas through

69 Ḥācī Aḥmed, *Risāle-i ʿacībe*, ff. 96b–98b; quoted by Terzioğlu, *Sufi and Dissident*, p. 202.

70 Gradeva, "Churches," p. 53. The founder of the movement, Qāḍīzāde Meḥmed Balıkesirli (from Balıkesir), should be, however, distinguished from Qāḍīzāde Meḥmed Sofyalı (from Sofia; d. 1631/2). See Zilfi, *Politics of Piety*, p. 255.

71 Filan, "Suije i kadizadelije," p. 186; see also Filan, "Life," pp. 335–337.

72 al-Samaqūwī, *Sharḥ*.

73 Aḥmad al-Ikhtimānī, *Sharḥ al-Tarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, MS St. Cyril and Methodius National Library, OP 2364.

74 In his *al-Ḥadīqa al-nadiyya.* Cf. Kenderova, *Knigi*, pp. 91f.

his *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*. Alikber Alikberov, who looked through the Samokov *waqf* library, published digitally a short but informative article in Russian defining the *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya* network as an "ecumenical movement in Islam," whose Balkan version is characterized by an anti-Christian polemic.[75] This strand of accusing of unbelief both heretical Muslims and non-Muslims needs further investigation, but this, however, falls beyond the scope of the present chapter.

Since the Qāḍīzadelis struggled against all perpetrators of heretical "innovations," principal among whom were the Sufis, Derin Terzioğlu, among others, went so far as to designate the mosque preachers' teaching "a Salafī message,"[76] while Fariba Zarinebaf, in her recent book on crime and punishment in Istanbul, refers to "the conservative Kadızadeli faction."[77] Such a complicated issue of terminology is among the factors enjoining further reflection around the question of how to qualify the movement inside the larger Islamic tradition, and a glimpse into the movement's views of unbelief could be a step toward this aim.[78]

3 Innovation as a Pathway to Unbelief

Along with the explicit discussions on *takfīr*, understanding how societies—including the Qāḍīzādeli-dominated central Ottoman lands in the seventeenth-century—mark the borderline between what they define as belief and unbelief requires a widening of the framework for inquiry. It involves the role of such key imperatives and concepts as *al-amr bi-l-maʿrūf wa-l-nahy ʿan al-munkar* ("commanding right and forbidding wrong"), *shirk* ("polytheism" or "associationism"), *jihād* ("holy struggle"), *al-salaf* ("the predecessors", i.e., the first three generations of Muslims), and *al-khalaf* ("the successors", i.e., the ensuing generations of the Muslim community), *hijra* (the "emigration,"

75 Alikberov, <http://islamica.ru/?uid=95>, accessed 12 February 2014. I would like to thank my fellow Arabist Dr. Anka Stoilova, archivist at the National Library in Sofia, for pointing me to this article as well as for her ceaseless help in my work with Arabic manuscripts.

76 Terzioğlu, *Sufi and Dissident*, p. 194. Although the elaboration of *Salafīyya* as related to Qāḍīzadelis is beyond the scope of this chapter, it must be noted that the designation "Salafī," and especially "Salafism," may be confusing as applied to phenomena prior to the twentieth century. See Lauzière, "Construction," pp. 369–389. For a recent sound analysis of Salafī Islam, see also Haykel, "On the Nature," pp. 33–38. The Salafī trends in post-classical Islam await closer examination, including in terms of *takfīr*.

77 Zarinebaf, *Crime*, p. 106.

78 Cf. Knysh, *Islam*, pp. 424–426.

implying the avoidance of association with unbelievers), and *bidʿa* (innovation). Below, I will demonstrate some of the connections between charges of unbelief and *bidʿa*. Despite the leading role the Ḥanafī *madhhab* played across the Ottoman Empire, entanglements among the schools of Islamic law must also be constantly reconsidered in analyzing such religious transformations as the adoption of the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya and his influential pupil Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350) by the Qāḍīzādelis, by their inspirer al-Birgiwī, and by other Ḥanafīs. Examining such factors will shed further light on whether the Qāḍīzādeli-revived interest in the Damascene Ḥanbalīs was a continuation of a trend among some Ottoman *ʿulamāʾ* traceable back to the sixteenth century, and if so, why that happened. However, sometimes apparent similarities can be misleading.

In his 2010 study, Khaled El-Rouayheb suggests that "the views of Birgiwî and his Kadizadeli followers may have been rooted, not in the thought of Ibn Taymiyya, but in an intolerant current within the Ḥanafī-Māturīdī school, represented by such scholars as ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Bukhārī (d. 842/1438), who famously declared both Ibn ʿArabi and Ibn Taymiyya unbelievers."[79] Al-Birgiwī's *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya* is so heavily loaded with traditions (*hadīth*s) that Michael Cook writes that "whether we should see in this an indication of the persistence of a traditionalist trend in Ḥanafism, antithetical to the predominant Māturidite theology, is more than I can say."[80] Therefore, "closing the circle" around the Qāḍīzādelis, with their undisguised admiration for Ibn Taymiyya's appeal for the eradication of blasphemous practices and unbelief,[81] demands firstly clarifying the foundations of their teachings to a sufficiently satisfactory extent, and then proceeding further with revealing the transregional and post-seventeenth-century spread of their revivalism. In other words, a first approximation invokes a retrospective approach to the sources of Qāḍīzādeli attitudes toward the question of setting a strict boundary between belief and unbelief.

Al-Birgiwī, who is generally recognized as the inspirer of the Qāḍīzādelis, deals with accusations of unbelief in his *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, while extensively discussing piety (*taqwā*), which Katharina Ivanyi sees as "at the

79 El-Rouayheb, "Changing Views," p. 304.

80 Cook, *Commanding Right*, p. 324 n. 127.

81 It is telling that the founder of the movement, Qāḍīzāde Meḥmed Efendi, expressed his political views through an expanded translation of Ibn Taymiyya's *al-Siyāsa al-sharʿiyya* into Ottoman Turkish, entitled *Tācü ʾr-resāʾil ve minhācü l-vesāʾil*, which he presented to Sultan Murād IV. For more details about this work, including about its possible attribution to another author, see Çavuşoğlu, *Ḳaḍīzādeli Movement*, pp. 93ff.

heart of Birgivī's concern in more than just a symbolic sense."[82] Explicitly, al-Birgiwī mentions *takfīr* only twice. The first mention is in the very introduction to his chapter on *taqwā* and appears after passages heavily loaded with Qurʾānic verses demonstrating the religious significance of piety. Following these verses al-Birgiwī offers a classification of the various religious doctrines and ritual practices of which *taqwā* is "the ultimate aim" (*ghāya*), such as ritual worship (*ʿibāda*), *dhikr*, fasting (*ṣawm*), and justice (*ʿadl*). Al-Birgiwī states that among the things constituting *taqwā* is also *takfīr al-sayyiʾāt*—the need for pious believers to accuse of unbelief those Muslims who are performing "bad things."[83] The second explicit occurrence of *takfīr* is in the same chapter on piety, in al-Birgiwī's explanation of the linguistic and legal aspects of *taqwā*.

According to al-Birgiwī, *taqwā* has two meanings in divine law (*fī l-sharīʿa*)—one general and one particular. In its particular meaning, *taqwā* refers to guarding the self from that which incurs punishment (*ʿuqūba*) and especially from grave sins (*kabāʾir*). Al-Birgiwī then goes on to tackle the question of whether or not minor sins (*ṣaghāʾir*) deserve legal punishment, and he formulates his opinion against the backdrop of two opposite positions:

> As to the minor sins, [some jurists] have said that they do not [deserve legal punishment] because through them a redemption for refraining from great sins is acquired and therefore they do not deserve to be punished. Others say "yes" because some exegetes have attributed the grave sins mentioned in the Qur'ān to the different types of idolatry, but no charge of unbelief is designated [for the minor sin] (*wa-amma l-ṣaghāʾir fa-qīla lā li-annahā mukaffara ʿan ijtināb al-kabāʾir fa-la-yastaḥiqqu bihā l-ʿuqūba, wa-qīla naʿm li-annā baʿd al-mufassirīn ḥamalū l-kabāʾir fī āyat al-karīma ʿalā anwāʿ al-shirk fa-lam yataʿayyan al-takfīr*). Thus the punishment for the minor sin is optional (*jāʾiz*) if the Sunnīs are refraining from committing grave sins.[84]

However, although this passage might seem casuistic and obscure in some of the phrasing, it becomes clear enough that al-Birgiwī is very cautious when calling for *takfīr*. On an explicit level, in this major work for a general Muslim audience, he prefers to mention *takfīr* only negatively, meaning that it is not

82 Ivanyi, *Virtue*, p. 131. I am indebted to Katharina Ivanyi for providing me with a copy of her recent unpublished PhD dissertation as well as for her fruitful comments during our conversations in Princeton.

83 al-Birgiwī, *Ṭarīqa*, p. 37.

84 al-Birgiwī, *Ṭarīqa*, p. 39.

to be applied regarding the minor sins. As for the grave sins, they are subject to their respective punishments (*ʿuqūba*), but it seems to remain an open question as to whether those punishments include excommunication and whether the grave sinner should be treated as an apostate (*murtadd*) who can be legally punished with all irreversible consequences.

Nevertheless, al-Birgiwī's views of other subjects distinguish him as a puritanical thinker calling for a stricter interpretation of the *sharīʿa*. It is telling that he particularly foregrounded his concerns about the proliferation of blasphemous innovation (*bidaʿ*). In his detailed classification of innovation, which appears at the very beginning of *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, right after the chapter on the imperative to adhere strictly to the Qurʾān and the Sunna, al-Birgiwī considers how *bidʿa* relates to unbelief (*kufr*). Some kinds of "innovation in faith" (*al-bidʿa fī l-iʿtiqād*) are tantamount to *kufr*, while others are equal to grave sins (*kabāʾir*).[85] Al-Birgiwī thus seems more inclined to struggle directly against the kinds of *bidʿa* that are tantamount to *kufr* rather than calling for a focus on *takfīr*, which is too closely linked to apostasy and hence to excommunication. As a religious scholar al-Birgiwī is fully aware that *takfīr* is consequential and he tends to avoid its direct usage, placing emphasis instead on heretical innovations (*bidʿa*). It seems that his Qāḍīzādeli followers, and especially Vānī Meḥmed Efendi,[86] continued to weigh *bidʿa* more heavily than other possible accusations that might be related to unbelief (*kufr*), but nevertheless they introduced a strongly activist element into the accusation of unbelief against other Muslims and non-Muslims.

The struggle against blasphemous *bidʿa* was revived during the seventeenth century in a treatise "On the Visitation of Graves" (*Ziyārat al-qubūr*), until recently attributed to al-Birgiwī, under whose name the work has been published and is distributed widely until today. Significantly, this treatise is extremely popular among Salafī, including Wahhābī, religious groups. In 2010, however, the Turkish scholar Ahmet Kaylı, in a study of al-Birgiwī's misattributions, developed a cogent argument that the treatise attacking popular practices among Sufis and other Muslims was not actually compiled by al-Birgiwī. Kaylı suggests that the author of this work written in Arabic is most probably al-Birgiwī's admirer Aḥmad al-Rūmī al-Aqḥiṣārī (d. 1041/1631 or 1043/1634)[87]—"the forgotten puritan from Anatolia" as Yahya Michot calls him, because this

85 al-Birgiwī, *Ṭarīqa*, p. 12.

86 On the mutual accusations between Vānī Meḥmed and the Sufi Niyāzī-i Miṣrī (d. 1694) see Çavuşoğlu, *Ḳaḍīzādeli Movement*, p. 177f., as well as Terzioğlu, *Sufi and Dissident*, pp. 128–32.

87 Kaylı, *A Critical Study*, pp. 52–66.

religious scholar "is almost completely absent from modern studies of the Ottoman 10th/16th–11th/17th centuries."[88]

The treatise on the veneration of tombs ascribed to al-Birgiwī opens with explicit mention of Ibn al-Qayyim:

> I have selected these pages from the book of Imām Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya *Ighāthat al-lahfān min maṣāiʾd al-shayṭān*, adding also some things that I have found in other works, because many nowadays worship some of the graves like idols. They pray next to them, perform the sacrificial rite, do things and say words that do not befit believers. Thereby, I wanted to clarify what is fixed in *sharīʿa* regarding this issue, so anyone who is determined to correct his faith can start discerning right from wrong, the truth from the lie of the Devil, salvation from eternal torment in Hell, and the gate to Paradise.[89]

Although the question of the veneration of tombs is not among the issues most extensively dealt with in *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, in several passages al-Birgiwī explicitly expresses his view that the visitation of graves is forbidden.[90] His opinion on this question is thus not different from the views of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim. Therefore, no matter whether the actual authorship of *Ziyārat al-qubūr* should be attributed to al-Birgiwī or to his contemporary al-Aqḥiṣārī,[91] which is otherwise an important source-critical puzzle, the compilation and wide circulation of this treatise are important evidence of the keen interest in the ideas of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya and his famous Ḥanbalī teacher Ibn Taymiyya[92] among Ottoman scholars, not only during the seventeenth but also during the sixteenth century.

On the other hand, however convincing the arguments for the lack of explicit references to Ibn Taymiyya in al-Birgiwī's works might seem, at this point a more

88 Michot, *Aḥmad al-Rūmī al-Aqḥiṣārī*, p. 3.

89 al-Birgiwī, *Ziyārat al-qubūr*, p. 7. Michot (*Aḥmad al-Rūmī al-Aqḥiṣārī*, p. 1 n. 2) indicates that the copy of al-Aqḥiṣārī's treatise on the same topic, although entitled *Radd al-qabriyya* or *Risāla fī al-radd ʿalā l-maqābiriyya*, opens with the same explicit reference to Ibn al-Qayyim.

90 al-Birgiwī, *Ṭarīqa*, pp. 181, 196, 216. Cf. Ivanyi, *Virtue*, pp. 37f. n. 87.

91 Who should not be confused with the Bosnian religious scholar Ḥasan al-Kāfī al-Aqḥiṣārī (d. 1024/1615).

92 Derin Terzioğlu ("Bir tercüme") studied the translation of Ibn Taymiyya's work *al-Siyāsa al-sharʿiyya* by ʿĀşıq Çelebī (d. 979/1572) presented to Sultan Selīm II and showed that both Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim were well known and read in seventeenth-century Anatolia.

implicit, unacknowledged influence of the medieval Damascene Ḥanbalī should not be excluded from the whole picture. In 2004, in a textual study conducted in Arabic that included an edition of al-Birgiwī's work *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn wa-kāshifat buṭlān al-mulḥīdīn*, the Saudi researcher Sulṭān Ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿArrābī developed a strong argument for how al-Birgiwī, whom he considers a great renewer (*mujaddid*) in Islam during the 10th/16th century,[93] directly borrowed from Ibn Taymiyya, though without explicit acknowledgment.[94] It thus turns out, for instance, that with respect to the question of the proliferation of *bidʿa*, al-Birgiwī elaborated his accusation of unbelief (*takfīr*) against the rationalist theological schools of the Muʿtazila and the Qadariyya by reiterating what was already opined by Ibn Taymiyya.[95]

Al-ʿArrābī delineates three types of sources on which al-Birgiwī draws: widely quoted and generally recognized Islamic sources such as the classical *ḥadīth* collections; works he cites explicitly, such as those by al-Ghazālī or Ibn al-Jawzī; and, finally, sources from which al-Birgiwī borrows—sometimes directly—without mentioning them explicitly.[96] Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim fall into the third category: al-Birgiwī borrowed heavily from them, including even entire pages, but did not mention them as references. Al-ʿArrābī then speculates that al-Birgiwī may have been motivated in this by caution: if he had explicitly acknowledged his admiration for Ibn Taymiyya's school, his works would have been not so widely accepted and might have even been rejected and suppressed by the ruling Ottoman religious establishment. Accordingly, al-Birgiwī borrowed from Ibn Taymiyya, including whole passages from his *fatāwā*, but in doing so, as al-ʿArrābī puts it, he was "just very slightly modifying them" (*bi-taṣarruf yasīr jiddan*).[97] If this claim reflects a contemporary Salafī-Wahhābī trend in Saudi Arabia to justify utilization of the work of authors like al-Birgiwī, I can so far not say with certainty. However, this argument seems to be based on solid textual research and as such is worth considering in establishing the inter-connections between Ibn Taymiyya, al-Birgiwī, and the Qāḍīzādelis.

As often happens in Islamic history, one and the same scholar can adopt views that, at first glance, seem to contradict to one another. In this case, even if al-Birgiwī agrees with Ibn al-Qayyim in the debates over the visitation of graves, this does not necessarily mean that the Ottoman scholar was influenced

---

93 al-ʿArrābī, *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn*, p. 52.
94 al-ʿArrābī, *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn*, p. 125.
95 al-ʿArrābī, *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn*, p. 198.
96 al-ʿArrābī, *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn*, p. 111.
97 al-ʿArrābī, *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn*, p. 114.

by the noted Ḥanbalī of Damascus in any other aspect of religious doctrine. In his *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, al-Birgiwī treats the study of disciplines such as speculative theology (*kalām*) and logic (*manṭiq*) as *farḍ kifāya*—a collective duty of the Muslim community—a view that, as El-Rouayheb rightly stresses, was "vehemently denied by Ibn al-Qayyim."[98] Al-Birgiwī's view can be explained by the contextual Ottoman traditions during his time and by the complexity of Islamic learning in general. Even though a wholesale borrowing from Ibn Taymiyya or Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya should be imputed neither to al-Birgiwī nor to all his Qāḍīzādeli followers, evidence of such an influence should not be neglected either.

The whole picture of the spread of more puritanical *sharīʿa*-minded ideas centering on establishing an Ottoman Islamic orthodoxy does not, however, involve only classical Middle Eastern influences and references to scholars from the Arab East. It seems that in the sixteenth century there were already Ottoman scholars prepared to wage this battle "from within." Typical of that trajectory is the activity of two scholars, both of whom switched from a military career to the ranks of the *ʿulamāʾ*: the Ottoman prince Shāhzāde Qūrqūd (d. 1513),[99] who spent a certain time in Mamlūk Egypt, and the famous Kamāl Pāshāzāde (d. 1534),[100] the most influential scholar of the formative period of the Ottoman Islamic religious establishment. Both of them tried to revive the classical Sunnī doctrine demarcating the boundaries between belief and unbelief for the purposes of the Ottoman state. In so doing, they provided a fresh view of *takfīr*, which contributed to the line already drawn in the works of al-Ghazālī and some Ḥanbalī scholars after him, such as Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1372–3), who are famous, among other things, for their appeal to Muslims to struggle against those who follow laws created by human beings instead of divine law (*sharīʿa*).

In terms of how to recognize unbelief and how to treat unbelievers, the concerns of the sixteenth-century Ottoman scholars were already highly complex. They involved the tension between the strict application of *sharīʿa* and the various innovations related to the *qānūn*, which—unlike divine law—expressed the will of the sultan, or even "heretical" interpretations of Islamic doctrines,

98 El-Rouayheb, "Changing Views," p. 303. For the revival of the study of logic during the seventeenth century see idem, "Revival."

99 The name is widely written in modern Turkish script as Şehzade Korkud. See [Shāhzāde] Qūrqūd, *Ḥall ashkāl al-afkār*, a recent Turkish translation of his treatise against unbelievers, written in Arabic, containing a facsimile of the manuscript.

100 Known as Ibn-i Kemāl or Kemalpaşazade, when using modern Turkish script for Ottoman names. More about his muftiship see Repp, *Müfti*, pp. 224–239.

such as those of the Shīʿa (represented mainly by the Ṣafavid-supported Qizilbāsh branch). Eventually, the classical question of who is an apostate re-emerged, and those Ottoman scholars found it necessary to broaden the scope of the rulings that had been suggested by al-Ghazālī. What to do with hidden unbelievers, with those who secretly profess a "false faith" or do not have any faith? How does one identify the hidden unbelievers among all those who publicly declare themselves believers?

These questions underlie some of the religious discussions to which Ottoman scholars of the sixteenth century, and particularly Shāhzāde Qūrqūd and Kamāl Pāshāzāde, made their own contribution. And whereas the latter compiled a work entitled *Risālat Takfīr al-rawāfiḍ* specifically targeting the Qizilbāshīs but including a more general explanation of the accusations of unbelief, Qūrqūd tackled the issue in a theological treatise, where he demonstrated how to discern the hidden unbelievers: Among other things, unbelievers wear clothes typical of non-Muslim communities, their attitude to the Qurʾān and the *ḥadīth* is disrespectful, they venerate idols or the sun, offer animal sacrifices, claim false prophethood, and practice sorcery.[101] Drawing upon al-Ashʿarī's definition of faith (*īmān*) as "sincerity" (*taṣdīq*),[102] Qūrqūd thus eventually broadened the answer to the question he put to himself of who is a Muslim and who is an apostate. Hidden unbelievers could be declared apostates, which opened the gate for new debates over the boundaries of belief and unbelief in the Ottoman age.

Subsequently, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, some of the most indicative examples of the spread of a shared intensification of orthodox belief are provided by the revived call for a ruthless struggle against the proliferation of blasphemous innovation (*bidʿa*) and for strict performance of the duty of "commanding right and forbidding wrong" (*al-amr bi-l-maʿrūf wa-l-nahy ʿan al-munkar*), which, prior to the seventeenth century, "does not seem to have been a prominent feature of the Ottoman religious scene."[103] When in the whole second chapter of his *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya* al-Birgiwī extensively deals with pernicious "innovations" he adduces a great deal of *ḥadīth* material to demonstrate that this is a subject of general importance for all Muslims: "Ibn al-Ḥārith reports that the Prophet said: There is no community (*umma*) introducing in its religion innovations after its prophet which did not

101 [Shāhzāde] Qūrqūd, *Ḥāfiẓ al-insān*, ff. 191a–215b. Cf. al-Tikriti, *Şehzade Korkud*, p. 161 n. 19.

102 This second form, *taṣdīq*, means particularly "accepting s.o.'s sincerity".

103 Cook, *Commanding Right*, p. 328.

thus destroy the Sunna (*mā min ummatin abdaʿat baʿda nabiyyihā fī dīniha bidʿatan illā aḍāʿat mithlahā al-sunna*)."[104]

The Qāḍīzādeli followers of al-Birgiwī were notorious for their insistence that it was the unavoidable duty of every true Muslim to actively "command right and forbid wrong." As Madeline Zilfi writes, Qāḍīzāde Meḥmed "asked of his adherents not only that they purify their own lives, but that they seek out sinners and in effect force them back onto 'the straight path'." Indeed, it was the task of all preachers to mention the duty of *al-amr bi-l-maʿrūf*, but Qāḍīzāde "introduced an 'activist element' that demanded that his listeners not only take an intellectual position but strive to make that position a reality in the community at large."[105] Kātib Çelebi, himself a disciple of Qāḍīzāde, covered the development of the movement, trying to take a neutral stance with respect to its controversies with the Sufis. Nevertheless, Kātib Çelebi noted that the Qāḍīzādelis were too demanding of the believers:

> ... If the people of any age after that of the Prophet were to scrutinize their own mode of life and compare it with the Sunna, they would find a wide discrepancy.... Scarcely any of the sayings or doings of any age are untainted by innovation.... For the rulers, what is necessary is to protect the Muslim social order and to maintain the obligations and principles of Islam among the people. As for the preachers, they will have done their duty if they gently admonish and advise the people to turn towards the Sunna and to beware of innovation (*bidʿa*). The duty of complying belongs to the people; they cannot be forced to comply.[106]

The perception of there having been a deviation from the straight path and of the need for a new socio-moral reconstruction, which motivated the passionate efforts of the urban Qāḍīzādeli movement, seemingly also spanned the Ottoman Arab world in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. An example is provided by Damascus during the reign of the powerful local notables, the ʿAẓms (ruled 1138/1725–1197/1783). Whether it is due to the policy of the ʿAẓms or to a "neo-Qāḍīzādeli" influence that spread eastwards, or to a combination of these factors, breaches of Islamic morality requiring the pursuit of "commanding right and forbidding wrong" strongly attracted public attention. Muslims conceived of this as the result of a long-lasting distortion of their original faith, the corruption of which was a consequence of the

104 al-Birgiwī, *Ṭarīqa*, p. 11.

105 Zilfi, *Politics of Piety*, p. 137.

106 Kātib Çelebi, *Balance*, p. 90.

proliferation of innovation (*bidʿa*).[107] The eighteenth-century Syrian chronicler al-Budayrī censures the moral laxity of his fellow Damascenes in a time when women sitting by the river, eating, drinking coffee, and smoking tobacco outnumbered men. Prostitution increased in Damascus in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but not to the extent noted by the chroniclers in the eighteenth century:

> In those days depravity grew (*izdāda al-fasād*), the worshipers were oppressed (*ẓalumat al-ʿubbād*), the number of lewd women (*banāt al-hawāʾ*) in the bazaars increased night and day. Among the events that happened during the reign of Asʿad Pasha [al-ʿAzm] those days is the following. A prostitute was infatuated, falling in love with a young man from the Turks who fell ill, so she vowed that if he was cured of his illness she would arrange a celebration in his honor with Shaykh Arslan. Soon the young man did recover and the prostitutes of the city (*mūmisāt al-balad*) gathered in a procession across the bazaars of Damascus, carrying candles, lamps, and incense burners with fragrance, clapping their hands and beating tambourines. The people crowded around them and rejoiced, while the prostitutes were with unveiled faces and with their hair loose. And there was nobody to censure this reprehensible act (*wa-mā thamma nākir li-hādhā l-munkar*), whilst the pious and devout people just raised their voices crying "Allah is the greatest" (*Allāhu akbar*).[108]

If the demands of pious individuals in Damascus faced the indifference of the ruling elite and even the judicial authorities, developments in Arabia took another direction—towards restoration of the original "true" beliefs and practices of Muslims. In Najd, in the central Arabian Peninsula, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and his followers initiated a rigorously puritanical movement, which soon established an alliance with the Ibn Saʿūd family: "[Saʿūd] ordered the inhabitants of Jeddah and Mecca to give up the smoking of tobacco, which is not permitted to be sold in the tavern. He ordered the people to enter the mosques when they hear the call for prayer (*al-ādhān*). He ordered the *ʿulamāʾ*

107 Abdul-Karim Rafeq ("Morality," p. 181) writes that breaches of the moral code "ranged from evil talk to wine drinking and prostitution." Coffee and tobacco, unlike opium, which was socially accepted and widespread, were prohibited earlier, but smoking was again legalized in the late sixteenth century, "and its addicts included a number of highly-placed *ʿulamāʾ* in Damascus."

108 al-Budayrī, *Ḥawādith Dimashq*, p. 112.

to read the works composed by Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb.[109] As a powerful movement against the proliferation of *bidʿa*, the Wahhābiyya often practiced violent *takfīr* towards their "corrupted" Arabian society, which they regarded as the land of savagery, blasphemy, and unbelief.[110]

Wahhābī steps to restore Islam as they imagined it to have been practiced by the *salaf* recall some of the actions taken in the preceding century by the Qāḍīzādelis. And if in Istanbul the Qāḍīzādeli alliance with imperial power came to an end in the 1680s, their revivalist intensification of Islamic identity and their striving to re-establish orthodoxy presumably extended in other directions and intertwined with the great revival and reform movements of the eighteenth century. However, the rise of the Qāḍīzādeli movement in the seventeenth century and the spread of Islamic revivalism in the eighteenth century seem to have been preceded not only by the notorious late-medieval Middle Eastern tradition of a stricter and more literalist interpretation of Islam offered by such Ḥanbalī scholars as Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim but also by a more "indigenous" strand of Ottoman puritanism, the proper understanding of which requires further work.

The ideas promoted by some sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Ottoman predecessors of the Qāḍīzādeli preachers, such as Kamāl Pāshāzāde, Shāhzāde Qūrqūd, and Aḥmed al-Rūmī al-Aqhiṣārī, together with al-Birgiwī himself, show that, however different these scholars might have been otherwise, there was also a clearly identifiable revivalist strand in the Ottoman religious scene. Despite the connections between these scholars and the existence of institutionalized religious networks, all of them shared a common revivalist opinion of what belief and unbelief were. Those scholars were concerned about setting stricter boundaries between belief and unbelief, including by reviving *takfīr*, prior to Qāḍīzāde Meḥmed Efendi and his contemporary and later interlocutors. At this stage of research, it seems that just as their inspirer al-Birgiwī had done, the Qāḍīzādelis themselvesforegrounded the need to eradicate *bidʿa* as more urgent than *takfīr* as a legal charge *stricto sensu*. Nevertheless, often their accusations of *bidʿa* were no less consequential than the classical idea of *takfīr* implies and reflected a deep conviction that the world around the few true believers was being corrupted by the spread of unbelief. This emphasis on *bidʿa* seems to be among the particular contributions of the revivalist Qāḍīzādeli movement and their orthodox Ottoman predecessors. When

109 Daḥlān, *Khulāṣat al-kalām*, p. 292.

110 For a recent analysis of the political context of early Wahhābī discourse on *takfīr* see Firro, "Political Context." See also Fattah, "'Wahhabi' Influences."

practising the accusations of *bidʿa*, the Qāḍīzādelis more than once seemed *as if* they practised *takfīr*.

Bibliography

Algar, Hamid, *Wahhabism: A Critical Essay*, Oneonta, NY 2002.

Alikberov, Alikber K., "Al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya ('Muhammadov put') na Balkanah pozdnego osmanskogo perioda," ["Al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya ('Muḥammadan Path') in the Balkans during the Late Ottoman Period"] *Islamica—Center for Arab and Islamic Studies* http://islamica.ru/?uid=95 (accessed 12/02/2014).

al-ʿArrābī, Sulṭān b. ʿUbayd b. ʿAbd Allāh, *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn wa-kāshifat buṭlān al-mulḥīdīn. Al-Imām Muḥammad b. Bīr ʿAlī Iskandar al-Birgiwī: Dirāsa wa-taḥqīq*, MA thesis, Jāmiʿat Umm al-Qurā, Mecca 1425/2004.

Asad, Talal, "Anthropological Conceptions of Religion: Reflections on Geertz," *Man*, New Series 18/2 (1983), pp. 237–259.

———, *The Idea of an Anthropology of Islam*, Washington, DC 1986.

al-Ashʿarī, Abū l-Ḥasan, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn wa-khtilāf al-muṣallīn*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī l-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Beirut 1411/1990.

Baer, Marc David, *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe*, Oxford 2007.

Berkey, Jonathan P., *Popular Preaching and Religious Authority in the Medieval Islamic Near East*, Seattle 2001.

al-Birgiwī, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī (Birgili, Meḥmed ʿAlī), *al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya wa-l-sīra al-nabawiyya al-Aḥmadiyya*, Cairo 1356/1937.

———, *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn wa-kāshifat buṭlān al-mulḥīdīn*, [published together with] al-ʿArrābī, Sulṭān b. ʿUbayd b. ʿAbd Allāh, *Dāmighat al-mubtadiʿīn wa-kāshifat buṭlān al-mulḥīdīn. Al-Imām Muḥammad b. Bīr ʿAlī Iskandar al-Birgiwī: Dirāsa wa-taḥqīq*, MA thesis, Jāmiʿat Umm al-Qurā, Mecca 1425/2004, pp. 148–407.

al-Birgiwī [?], Muḥammad b. ʿAlī (Birgili, Meḥmed ʿAlī) [attribution uncertain], *Ziyārat al-qubūr al-sharʿiyya wa-l-shirkiyya*, Amman 1996.

al-Budayrī, Aḥmad al-Ḥallaq, *Ḥawādith Dimashq al-yawmiyya 1154–1176 AH / 1741–1763*, ed. Aḥmad ʿIzzat ʿAbd al-Karīm, [Cairo] 1959.

Calder, Norman, "The Limits of Islamic Orthodoxy," in *Intellectual Traditions in Islam*, ed. Farhad Daftary, London 2000, pp. 66–86.

Çavuşoğlu, Semiramis, *The Ḳaḍīzādeli Movement: An Attempt of Şeriat-Minded Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 1990.

Cook, Michael, *Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong in Islamic Thought*, Cambridge 2004.

———, "On the Origins of Wahhābism," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 2 (1992), pp. 191–202.

Daḥlān, Aḥmad b. Zaynī, *Khulāṣat al-kalām*, Cairo 1305/1887.

El-Rouayheb, Khaled, "From Ibn Hajar al-Haytamī (d. 1566) to Khayr al-Dīn al-Ālūsī (d. 1899): Changing Views of Ibn Taymiyya among non-Ḥanbalī Sunni Scholars," in *Ibn Taymiyya and His Times*, ed. Yossef Rapoport and Shahab Ahmed, Karachi 2010, pp. 269–318.

———, "Was There a Revival of Logical Studies in Eighteenth-Century Egypt?" *Die Welt des Islams* 45 (2005), pp. 1–19.

Evstatiev, Simeon, "The Qāḍīzādeli Movement and the Spread of Islamic Revivalism in the Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire: Preliminary Notes," *CAS Working Papers Series*, Center for Advanced Study, Sofia 2013, pp. 1–37.

Fattah, Hala, "'Wahhabi' Influences, Salafi Responses: Shaikh Mahmud Shukri and the Iraqi Salafi Movement, 1745–1930," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 14 (2003), pp. 127–148.

Fierro, Maria Isabel, "Heresy in al-Andalus," in *The Legacy of Muslim Spain*, ed. Salma Khadra Jayyusi, Leiden 1992, pp. 895–908.

Filan, Kerima, "Life in Sarajevo in the 18th Century (According to Mulla Mustafa's *Mecmua*)," in *Living in the Ottoman Ecumenical Community: Essays in Honour of Suraiya Faroqhi*, ed. Vera Costantini and Markus Koller, Leiden 2008, pp. 317–346.

———, "Suije i kadizadelije u osmanskom Sarajevu," *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke*, Knjiga XXIX–XXX, Sarajevo 2009, pp. 163–186.

Firro, Tarik K., "The Political Context of Early Wahhabi Discourse of *Takfir*," *Middle Eastern Studies* 49 (2013), pp. 770–789.

Fleischer, Cornell H., *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541–1600)*, Princeton 1986.

Flemming, Barbara, "Die vorwahhabitische Fitna im osmanischen Kairo, 1711," *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı'ya Ar-mağan*, Ankara 1976, pp. 55–65.

Le Gall, Dina, "Kadızadelis, Nakşbendis, and Intra-Sufi Diatribe in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 28 (2004), pp. 1–28.

al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid, *Über Rechtgläubigkeit und religiöse Toleranz, Eine Übersetzung der Schrift Das Kriterium der Unterscheidung zwischen Islam und Gottlosigkeit*, trans. Frank Griffel, Zürich 1998.

———, *Fayṣal al-tafriqa bayna l-Islām wa-l-zandaqa*, ed. Maḥmūd Bayjū, [Damascus] 1413/1993.

———, *Shifāʾ al-ghalīl fī bayān al-shubah wa-l-mukhīl*, ed. Ḥamad ʿUbayd al-Kubaysī, Baghdad 1390/1971.

Gibb, H.A.R., *Modern Trends in Islam*, New York 1972.

Goldziher, Ignaz, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, Heidelberg 1910.

Gradeva, Rossitsa, "The Churches in the Life of Sofia Citizens (Preliminary Notes)," in *Religion and Boundaries: Studies from the Balkans, Eastern Europe and Turkey*, ed. Galia Valtchinova, Istanbul 2010, pp. 47–79.

Greene, Molly, *A Shared World: Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, Princeton 2000.

Griffel, Frank, "Toleration and Exclusion: al-Shāfiʿī and al-Ghazālī on the Treatment of Apostates," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 64 (2001), pp. 339–354.

Ḥācī Aḥmed, *Risāle-i ʿacībe*, MS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Bağdat 404.

Hathaway, Jane, "Rewriting Eighteenth-Century Ottoman History," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 19 (2004), pp. 29–53.

———, "The Grand Vizier and the False Messiah: The Sabbatai Sevi Controversy and the Ottoman Reform in Egypt," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117 (1997), pp. 665–671.

al-Ḥaṭṭāb, Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, *Mawāhib al-jalīl li-sharḥ mukhtaṣar Khalīl* 1–6, Tripoli [Libya] n.d.

Haykel, Bernard, "On the Nature of Salafi Thought and Action," in *Global Salafism: Islam's New Religious Movement*, ed. Roel Meijer, New York 2009, pp. 33–57.

———, *Revival and Reform in Islam: The Legacy of Muhammad al-Shawkānī*, Cambridge 2003.

Hirschler, Konrad, "Pre-Eighteenth-Century Traditions of Revivalism: Damascus in the Thirteenth Century," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 68 (2005), pp. 195–214.

Ibn Nujaym, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn b. Ibrāhīm, *al-Ashbāh wa al-naẓāʾir ʿalā madhhab Abī Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān*, ed. ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Faḍīlī, Beirut 1418/1998.

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Ighāthat al-lahfān fī ḥukm ṭalāq al-ghaḍbān*, ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qāsimī, Cairo 1327/1909–10.

Ivanyi, Katharina Anna, *Virtue, Piety and the Law: A Study of Birgivī Meḥmed Efendī's Al-Ṭarīqa Al-Muḥammadiyya*, PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 2012.

Izutsu, Toshihiko, *The Concept of Belief in Islamic Theology*, Salem 1988.

Jackson, Sherman A., *On the Boundaries of Theological Tolerance in Islam: Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī's Fayṣal al-Tafriqa*, New York 2002.

Kātib Çelebi, *Fezleke-i Kātib Çelebi* 1–2, Istanbul 1286/1870.

———, Mustafa b. Abdullah Kâtip Çelebi, Hacı Halife, *The Balance of Truth* [*Mīzān al-ḥaqq fī-khtiyār al-aḥaqq*], trans. Geoffrey L. Lewis, London 1957.

Kaylı, Ahmet, *A Critical Study of Birgivî Mehmed Efendi's Works and their Dissemination in Manuscript Form*, MA thesis, Boğaziçi Üniversity, Istanbul 2010.

Kenderova, Stoyanka, *Knigi, biblioteki i chitatelski interesi sred samokovskite myusyulmani* (*XVIII—purvata polovina na XIX vek*) [*Books, Libraries, and Readers' Interests among Samokov Muslims* (*Eighteenth–the First Half of the Ninetieth Centuries*)], Sofia 2002.

Knysh, Alexander, "A Clear and Present Danger: 'Wahhabism' as a Rhetorical Foil," *Die Welt des Islams* 44 (2004), pp. 3–26.

———, *Islam in Historical Perspective*, Upper Saddle River, NJ 2011.

———, " 'Orthodoxy' and 'Heresy' in Medieval Islam: An Essay of Reassessment," *The Muslim World* 83 (1993), 48–67.

Krstić, Tijana, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, Stanford 2011.

Lauzière, Henri, "The Construction of *Salafiyya*: Reconsidering Salafism from the Perspective of Conceptual History," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 42 (2010), pp. 369–389.

Levtzion, Nehemia and John O. Voll (eds.), *Eighteenth-Century Renewal and Reform in Islam*, Baltimore 1987.

Levtzion, Nehemia and John O. Voll, "Introduction." *Eighteenth-Century Renewal and Reform in Islam*, Baltimore 1987, pp. 3–20.

Lewis, Bernard, "Some Observations on the Significance of Heresy in the History of Islam," *Studia Islamica* 1 (1953), pp. 43–63.

Masters, Bruce A., "The View from the Province: Syrian Chronicles of the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994), pp. 353–362.

Michot, Yahya, *Aḥmad al-Rūmī al-Aqḥiṣārī* (*d. 1041/1631 or 1043/1634*) *Against Smoking: An Ottoman Manifesto, Introduction, Editio Princeps and Translation*, Markfield 2010.

Naʿīmā, Muṣṭafā, *Tārīh-i Naʿīmā* 1–6, Istanbul 1280/1863–64.

al-Nābulusī, ʿAbd al-Ghānī, *al-Ḥadīqa al-nadiyya: Sharḥ al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, Istanbul 1873/1991.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar, "XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dinde Tasfiye (Puritanizm) Teşebbüslerine Bir Bakış: Kadızâdeliler Hareketi," *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* 17–21 i–ii (1979–1983), pp. 208–225.

O'Fahey, Rex S., *Enigmatic Saint: Aḥmad Ibn Idrīs and the Idrīsi Tradition*, London 1990.

———, and Bernd Radtke, "Neo-Sufism Reconsidered," *Der Islam* 70 (1993), pp. 52–87.

Öztürk, Necati, *Islamic Orthodoxy among the Ottomans in the Seventeenth Century with Special Reference to the Qāḍī-zade Movement*, PhD dissertation, Edinburgh University, 1981.

Peirce, Leslie, "Changing Perceptions of the Ottoman Empire: The Early Centuries," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 19 (2004), pp. 6–28.

Peters, Rudolph, "The Battered Dervishes of Bab Zuwayla: A Religious Riot in Eighteenth-Century Cairo," in *Eighteenth-Century Renewal and Reform in Islam*, ed. Nehemia Levtzion and John O. Voll, Baltimore 1987, pp. 93–115.

———, "*Idjtihād* and *Taqlīd* in 18th and 19th Century Islam," *Die Welt des Islams* 20 (1980), pp. 131–145.

———, "Islamischer Fundamentalismus: Glauben, Handeln, Führung," in *Max Webers Sicht des Islams: Interpretation und Kritik*, ed. Wolfgang Schluchter, Frankfurt a.M. 1987, pp. 217–242.

———, “Reinhard Schulze’s Quest for an Islamic Enlightenment,” Die Welt des Islams NS 30 (1990), pp. 160–62.

Peters, Rudolph and Gert J.J. De Vries, “Apostasy in Islam,” *Die Welt des Islams* 17 (1976–77), pp. 1–25.

Qāḍīzāde Meḥmed Efendi, *Tācü ’r-resā’il ve minhācü l-vesā’il*, MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 1926.

[Shāhzāde] Qūrqūd (Şehzade Korkud) = Muḥammad Qūrqūd al-ʿUthmānī b. Abī Yazīd b. Muḥammad b. Murād, *Ḥāfiẓ al-insān ʿan lāfiẓ al-imān*, MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Aya Sofya 2289.

———, *Kitāb Ḥall ashkāl al-afkār fī ḥill amwāl al-kuffār*, facsimile published in Şehzâde Korkud, *İslâm’da Ganimet ve Cariyelik, Osmanlı Sistemine İçeriden Bir Eleştiri*, Yayına Hazırlayan: Asım Cüneyd Köksal, Arapça Aslından Çeviren: Osman Güman, Istanbul 2013, pp. 1–123.

Radtke, Bernd, *Autochthone islamische Aufklärung im 18. Jahrhundert: Theoretische und filologische Bemerkungen. Fortführung einer Debatte*, Utrecht 2000.

Rafeq, Abdul-Karim, “Public Morality in the 18th Century Ottoman Damascus,” *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 55–56 (1990), pp. 180–196.

Rahman, Fazlur, *Islam*, London 1966.

Repp, Richard Cooper, *The Müfti of Istanbul: A Study in the Development of the Ottoman Learned Hierarchy*, London 1986.

Ricaut, Sir Paul, *The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire, Containing the Maxims of the Turkish Polity, the Most Material points of the Mahometan religion, Their Sects and Heresies, Their Convents and Religious Votaries … in Three Books*, London 1686.

al-Saʿīdī, ʿAbd al-Mutaʿālī, *al-Ḥurriyya al-dīniyya fī l-lslām*, Cairo ²n.d.

a-Samaqūwī, Aḥmad al-Kashfī, *Sharḥ al-Tarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, MS Sofia, National Library, OP 1037.

Sariyannis, Marinos, “The Kadizadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon: The Rise of a ‘Mercantile Ethic’?” in *Political Initiatives ‘From the Bottom Up’ in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos, Halcyon Days in Crete VII, A Symposium Held in Rethymno 9–11 January 2009, Rethymno 2012, pp. 263–289.

Schacht, Joseph, *An Introduction to Islamic Law*, Oxford 1982.

Schöck, Cornelia, “Belief and Unbelief in Classical Sunnī Theology,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Three*, 2010/2, pp. 101–111.

Sedgwick, Mark, *Saints and Sons: The Making and Remaking of the Rashīdi Aḥmadi Sufi Order, 1799–2000*, Leiden 2005.

al-Shāfiʿī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Idrīs, *Kitāb al-Umm* 1–7, Cairo 1321–25[/1903–08].

Terzioğlu, Derin, “Bir tercüme ve bir intihal vakası: Ya da İbn Teymiyye’nin *Siyasetü’ş-şer‘iyye*’sini Osmanlıcaya kim(ler) nasıl aktardı?” *Journal of Turkish Studies = Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 31 (2007), pp. 247–275.

———, “Man in the Image of God in the Image of the Times: Sufi Self-Narratives and the Diary of Niyazi-i Misri (1618–94),” *Studia Islamica* 94 (2002), pp. 139–165.

———, *Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyāzī-i Mişrī (1618–1694)*, PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1999.

———, “Sunna-Minded Sufi Preachers in Service of the Ottoman State: The *Naṣīḥatnāme* of Hasan Addressed to Murad IV,” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 27 (2010), pp. 241–312.

al-Tikriti, Nabil Sirri, *Şehzade Korkud (ca. 1468–1513) and the Articulation of Early 16th-Century Ottoman Religious Identity*, PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 2004.

al-ʿUthaymīn, ʿAbd Allāh Ṣāliḥ, *Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb: The Man and His Works*, London 2009.

van Ess, Josef, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra*, vol. 1, Berlin 1991.

Voll, John O. “Linking Groups in the Networks of Eighteenth-Century Revivalist Scholars: The Mizjaji Family in Yemen,” in *Eighteenth-Century Renewal and Reform in Islam*, ed. Nehemia Levtzion and John O. Voll, Baltimore 1987, pp. 69–92.

———, “Neo-Sufism Reconsidered Again,” *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne des Études Africaines* 42 ii/iii (2008), pp. 314–330.

———, “Renewal and Reform in Islamic History: Tajdid and Islah,” in *Voices of Resurgent Islam*, ed. John L. Esposito, New York 1983.

———, “The Sudanese Mahdi: Frontier Fundamentalist,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 10 (1979), 145–166.

Zarinebaf, Fariba, *Crime and Punishment in Istanbul 1700/1800*, Berkeley 2010.

Ze’evi, Dror, *Producing Desire: Changing Sexual Discourse in the Ottoman Middle East, 1500–1900*, Berkeley 2006.

Zilfi, Madeline C., “The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45 (1986), pp. 251–269.

———, *The Politics of Piety: The Ottoman Ulema in the Post-Classical Age (1600–1800)*, Minneapolis 1988.

Accusations of Unbelief in Islam

A Diachronic Perspective on Takfīr

Edited by

Camilla Adang, Hassan Ansari,
Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Ms. Berlin, Landberg 437. Fol. 50v. (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin). With kind permission.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Accusations of unbelief in Islam: a diachronic perspective on takfir / Edited by Camilla Adang, Hassan Ansari, Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke.
pages cm. — (Islamic history and civilization ; v. 123)
ISBN 978-90-04-30473-4 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-30783-4 (e-book)
1. Kufr (Islam) 2. Islam—Doctrines—History. I. Adang, Camilla, editor. II. Ansari, Hasan, 1970 or 1971-, editor. III. Fierro, Ma. Isabel (María Isabel), editor. IV. Schmidtke, Sabine, editor.
BP166.785.A39 2015
297.2—dc23

2015030452

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities.
For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0929-2403
ISBN 978-90-04-30473-4 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-30783-4 (e-book)

Contents